```
j562van1
1
     UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
     SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
     -----x
 2
                                             New York, N.Y.
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
 3
                                             18 Cr. 30(PAC)
                V.
 4
     PAUL VAN MANEN and KENNETH
 5
     CHARLTON,
6
                    Defendants.
        -----x
                                            Trial
 7
                                             May 6, 2019
 8
                                             10:20 a.m.
     Before:
9
                          HON. PAUL A. CROTTY,
10
                                             District Judge
11
                                             - and a Jury-
12
                               APPEARANCES
     GEOFFREY S. BERMAN
          United States Attorney for the
13
          Southern District of New York
     BY: JESSICA K. FENDER
14
          RYAN B. FINKEL
15
          CATHERINE E. GHOSH
          Assistant United States Attorneys
16
     QUIJANO & ENNIS, P.C.
17
          Attorney for Defendant Van Manen
     BY: PETER E. QUIJANO
          ANNA N. SIDERIS
18
     O'NEILL & HASSEN
19
          Attorney for Defendant Charlton
20
     BY: GRAINNE E. O'NEILL
21
     THE LAW OFFICE OF CARLOS M. SANTIAGO
          Attorney for Defendant Charlton
22
     BY: CARLOS M. SANTIAGO, JR.
23
     ALSO PRESENT:
24
     MADISON DUNBAR, Paralegal, U.S. Attorney's Office
25
     WILLIAM COLEMAN, Paralegal, U.S. Attorney's Office
     LILY LAU, Paralegal, Quijano & Ennis
```

(In open court)

THE COURT: Good morning. The jury is just about ready, but I thought I would -- we received a number of motions over the weekend. I'm going to rule on those motions now.

With respect to the government's motion to redact the racial slurs in CW1's text message, that motion is granted.

The request to modify the protective order is denied.

With respect to character evidence for Mr. Van Manen and Mr. Charlton, I'm going to allow that to a limited extent. It's contingent on their taking the stand. Because if it is just testified to or spoken of by counsel, counsel is not sworn and they can't testify, and the opening statements are supposed to be predictions of what is going to be said in evidence, admitted into evidence in the courtroom. So I'm prepared to allow a limited explanation or exposition of the defendants' character in the opening statements; but, as I say, it is contingent on their taking the stand. If they don't take the stand, the remarks by counsel will be subject to being stricken.

With respect to the Exhibits 262, 267, 268, 269 and 270, I will allow one picture only.

And with regard to the proffer statement, I can't rule on that now because I don't know what the statements are. I note, for example, in the last statement covered by

Mr. Quijano's letter about defendant's proffer number 12 the

defendant will not contest that during certain -- you are asking for rulings on things that might not happen. As Mr. Quijano says in his letter, he is mindful of the parameters which would lead to the introduction of the defendant's proffer statement should he argue or introduce evidence that contradicts statements made during his proffer with the government. I will take him at his word. We will just have to see what the statements are and make rulings as we go along.

Anything else anybody wants to take up?

MR. QUIJANO: No, your Honor.

MS. O'NEILL: No, your Honor.

MR. FINKEL: Just two or three housekeeping measures that I want to put on the record. First, since I handed this up to Mr. Gonzalez, the parties have three additional names to add to the people and places list. One was from the government. It is an Albanian interpreter. Two were possible witnesses that defendant Kenneth Charlton would call.

It is the government's understanding that this universe — there is no one else in the universe of possible witnesses that the defendants may call. We would ask that the court inquire that that is correct to ensure that the jury is properly *voir dired* on all of the possible people who can appear as witnesses at this trial.

THE COURT: Ms. O'Neill.

MS. O'NEILL: So far we have no other additional

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

witnesses. I have nothing else really to speak about that.

THE COURT: Okay.

Mr. Quijano.

MR. QUIJANO: Nothing further, your Honor.

THE COURT: Okay.

MR. QUIJANO: We have no witnesses other than the defendant, possible.

THE COURT: Okay. I understand.

MR. FINKEL: Can I just put on the record, your Honor, two other issues?

One, Philip -- I hope I am pronouncing this correctly -- Primason, which is one of the witnesses that defendant Kenneth Charlton may call, the defendants have agreed to exclude him from the courtroom even though he worked with the prosecution team in case he is called as a witness. Sorry, defense team.

And, second, just to let your Honor know, we have prepared transcripts of some of the call recordings that will be played when witnesses take the stand. We are prepared to hand up packets of the various transcripts for the jury to review. They are not being offered as evidence, just as an aid to the jury during the testimony of a witness.

THE COURT: All right.

Ms. O'Neill.

MS. O'NEILL: Just for clarification, it is Philip

Primason, not Primason.

THE COURT: Okay. Thank you for the clarification.

(Pause)

MR. FINKEL: Your Honor, if I may just put one additional item on the record? Defendant Kenneth Charlton's team has asked the government to assist them in getting a writ for Nicholas Mogavero, who is a witness they may call. The government has asked your Honor to sign the writ. We are going to process that with our criminal clerk's office.

THE COURT: I signed the writ.

MR. FINKEL: Yes. I just wanted to put it on the record.

THE COURT: Thank you.

MS. O'NEILL: Thank you, your Honor.

(Jury of 12 and 2 alternates impaneled and sworn)

THE COURT: Here is what we are going to do now. We are going to give you some preliminary instructions, then we will take an afternoon break, then the parties will make opening statements and, if we are lucky, we will have our first witness sworn and start his testimony today.

But I want to take a few minutes now to give you some initial instructions about this case and about your duties as jurors. After all the evidence is in and the lawyers have summed up, I will give you final instructions, and then you will begin your deliberations. I may also give you

instructions during the trial. Unless I specifically tell you otherwise, all such instructions — both those I give you now and those I give you later — are equally binding on you and you must follow them.

Your duty is to find from the evidence what the facts are. You, and you alone, are the judges of those facts, and then you apply the law as I give it to you to the facts as you find them to reach your verdict. You have to follow the law whether or not you agree with it. Now, please remember that nothing I may say or do during the course of the trial is intended to indicate or should be taken by you to be indicating what your verdict should be. Your verdict is up to you. It is strictly up to you.

I have already told you about the charges alleged in this case. The defendants, Paul Van Manen and Kenneth Charlton, are charged with conspiring to violate the narcotics laws of the United States and were appropriately indicted by a grand jury sitting here in this district. The indictment charges that from at least in or about 2013, up to and including in or about January 2018, Mr. Van Manen and Mr. Charlton, along with others known and unknown, conspired to distribute, or possess with the intent to distribute, controlled substances, specifically heroin and fentanyl. The indictment further charges as to Mr. Van Manen only that the use of heroin and fentanyl distributed through the conspiracy

resulted in the serious bodily injury of an individual named Shaun Sullivan on or about October 5, 2017, and the death of another individual, Michael Ogno, on or about December 1, 2017. Mr. Van Manen and Mr. Charlton deny these allegations. The government must prove the charges in the indictment beyond a reasonable doubt.

The evidence from which you are going to find the facts will consist of the testimony of the witnesses who will sit right next to me in this chair, documents and others things that will be received in evidence, and occasionally facts that the parties may agree to, which we call stipulations.

Now, certain things are not evidence, and you should not consider them. I'm going to list them for you.

First of all, the attorneys' arguments are not evidence. The attorneys are not sworn as witnesses. They are not under oath, and they do not testify. The attorneys' statements and questions are not evidence either. Let me emphasize this again. It is not the question that the lawyer asks, what is important is the witness's answer to the question.

Secondly, objections to questions are also not evidence. It is the duty of the attorneys for each side of the case to object when the other side offers testimony or other evidence that the attorney believes is not properly admissible. You should not be influenced by objections or by my ruling on

"sustained." Then you should ignore the question. If I overrule the objection, then you should treat the answer just like any other answer. My job is to rule on what evidence comes in at the trial, but I have no view on what your verdict should be, because that is strictly up to you, the jury, to decide.

If I instruct you that some evidence is being received for a limited purpose only, you must follow that instruction. Now, you don't have to worry about this right now. There may not be a limiting instruction in this case. But if there is, I will explain it to you at the time and will give you instructions as clearly as I possibly can on what the limitations are. I may tell you that I am excluding testimony or tell you to disregard testimony. When I do that, it means you should follow my instructions and ignore the testimony as it is not in evidence.

In addition, anything you may have seen or heard outside of this courtroom is not evidence and should be disregarded. You are to decide this case solely on the admissible evidence that is presented here in the courtroom.

There are two kinds of evidence that I want to review with you -- direct evidence and circumstantial evidence.

Direct evidence is proof of a fact. An example of that would be an eyewitness, somebody who actually saw the event as it

occurred. Circumstantial evidence is proof of a fact or facts from which you may infer or conclude that some other fact or facts exist. Obviously I'm going to give you further instructions on this and more details on these and other matters at the end of the case, but just keep in mind that you can consider both kinds of evidence, both direct and circumstantial.

Now, a very important task for every jury is to decide the credibility of witnesses, and it is going to be up to you to decide which witnesses to believe, which witnesses not to believe, how much of any witness's testimony to accept or reject. Again, in my instructions to you at the end of the trial, I will give you some guidelines which I hope will be helpful in determining witness credibility.

Remember what we discussed earlier. First, a law enforcement witness's testimony gets no greater or lesser weight because of their law enforcement status. Second, cooperating witness's testimony can be considered but, as I will instruct you, you should consider it with great care.

This is a criminal case. You must know that there are three basic rules about criminal law that you have to keep in mind: (1) the defendants are presumed innocent; (2) the government has the burden of proof; and (3) the government must prove its case beyond a reasonable doubt.

Let me go through these separately now.

First, as I mentioned, the defendants are presumed innocent until proven guilty. The indictment against the defendants brought by the government is only an accusation and nothing more. It is not proof of guilt or anything else. The defendants, therefore, start out with an absolutely clean slate.

Second, the burden of proof is on the government. The defendants have no burden to prove their innocence or to present any evidence or to testify. Since they have the right to remain silent, the law prohibits you from arriving at your verdict by considering that the defendants may have not testified.

Third, the government must prove the defendants' guilt beyond a reasonable doubt. Again, I will give you further detailed instructions on this point later, but bear in mind that in this respect, a criminal case is different from a civil case. The criminal standard of proof is proof beyond a reasonable doubt.

From time to time during the trial, it may become necessary for me to talk with the lawyers out of the hearing of the jury, either by having a conference at the bench when the jury is present in the courtroom — that's what we call a sidebar — or by calling a recess. Please understand that while you are waiting, we are working. The purpose of any conference outside your viewing is not to keep relevant

information from you, but to decide certain procedural issues and how certain evidence is to be treated under the rules of evidence and to avoid confusion and error.

Now just a few words about your own conduct as jurors. First of all, do not discuss the case with anyone or permit anyone to discuss it with you. Most of you probably use computers. My instruction to not discuss the case includes discussing the case in person, in writing, by phone or electronic means, via text messaging, e-mail, Facebook,

Twitter, blogging, or any other form of social media. This even includes discussing the case with your fellow jurors in the jury room while the trial is going on. You cannot deliberate on your verdict until after you are charged by me, and that takes place at the end of the trial. Until then, you simply cannot talk about the case, so you can talk to each other about almost anything that you would like, but don't talk about the case.

Now, I'm sure this may seem strange to you. Here is the reason. Obviously the evidence can only be presented one witness at a time and one exhibit at a time. we don't want you to start talking to each other and reaching conclusions before you've had an opportunity to see and hear all the evidence in the case and hear my instructions on the law. So that is why we direct you to begin your deliberations at the end and, until that time, not to have any discussion about this case. Think

of the case like a painting where you cannot tell from one stroke or color what the painting will look like. You have to wait until it is finished to make a judgment, and that's what we ask you to do.

If at any time during the course of this trial any person attempts to talk to you or communicate with you about the case, either inside or outside the courthouse -- and I certainly hope this does not happen -- you should immediately report such an attempt to me. Don't bring it to the attention of other jurors, just send me a note directly.

Also the lawyers and other participants at the counsel table have been instructed not to have any communication with you as jurors. That's the rule. You may not say hello or even wave. That goes for you, the lawyers, and the witnesses. In this courthouse, you may see people in the elevators. So if you run into one another, please don't acknowledge them or expect them to acknowledge you. They are under instructions not to have any communications, and they are going to observe that rule.

If at any point in the trial you recognize someone in the courtroom, including a friend or family member, please let me know immediately. If this occurs while the trial is in session, please raise your hand.

Don't read or listen to anything touching upon this case in any way. Don't try to do any research on your own or

conduct your own investigation. This means, for example, that you should not consult a dictionary, search the Internet, websites or blogs, or use any electronic tools to obtain information about this case. If you see something about this case in the newspaper, you must not read the article. Avoid watching television discussions about this case or issues involved in this case. Your sworn duty is to decide this case solely and wholly on the evidence presented in this courtroom.

If you wish, you can take notes while the evidence is being presented to you. This is permitted because so many people find that taking notes helps them focus on the testimony being given. You should not try to summarize the testimony, however. We have two excellent court reporters who take down everything said throughout the trial. Your job is to listen to the testimony and assess the credibility of witnesses. If you do take notes, do not let it distract you from that task.

Moreover, your notes are for your private use only, as a way to help you recall the testimony when you begin your deliberations. Your notes are not entitled to any greater weight than the recollection of a juror who did not take notes. Finally, you may not take your notes away from the court.

Leave them in the jury room at the end of each day.

Let me tell you again how important your service is and how much we appreciate it. During a trial, all of us have to be here before any work can be done -- that includes the

attorneys; the witnesses; the court reporter; me, the judge; and you, the jury. If one person is missing, everything stops. That's why this makes it a little bit different from work. This is not a situation where you can simply call in sick. There are, of course, extraordinary circumstances that may excuse you from serving on this jury, but in all other circumstances, we need you to be here every day and on time. I understand that this may impose a burden but, as I have said, this is an important service and one that is greatly appreciated.

The trial day starts at 9:30 except for Fridays, when we start at 9 a.m. About half an hour before we start, we will open up the jury room and provide you with a light breakfast.

Coffee and a little snack, some tea. We also provide you with an afternoon snack when we take our afternoon break. We cannot provide you with lunch.

The morning session will last until 12:45. On Monday through Thursday, we will resume at 2:00 and go until 4:30. On Fridays, we will end at 1 p.m. with no afternoon session.

There are breaks in the morning and afternoon for 15 minutes.

Here is how we are going to proceed. The government will make an opening statement, which is an outline of what they hope to prove and to help you understand the evidence as it comes in. Next, the defendants may make an opening statement, but they do not have to. Please remember as you

listen to the opening statements by the lawyers that their statements are not evidence.

Then government will start presenting its witnesses and the defense may cross-examine those witnesses. Following the government's case, the defendants may, if they wish, present witnesses, but they do not have to do so.

After all the evidence is in, each side will have the opportunity to get up again and present their closing arguments to you. In these arguments, they are going to summarize and interpret the evidence.

And then of course I will instruct you on the law.

After all that is completed, you will retire to deliberate on your verdict.

Now for some housekeeping matters. Let me introduce David Gonzalez, who is my courtroom deputy. You are going to be working with Mr. Gonzalez. He will help you in the jury. Room he will give you the notepads if you want to take notes. If you have any troubles or problems, see Mr. Gonzalez.

Amy Torres and Annie O'Toole are my two law clerks who assist me on legal matters. Our court reporter is Kristen Carannante, and Eve Giniger is the other lady who takes notes.

So we are going to take a break now for about ten minutes. You can hang up your stuff, and then we will resume with the opening statements.

We are going to rearrange your seats so that the first

j562van1 six seats in the first row, six seats in the second row will be all together, and the two alternates will sit in the third row by themselves. We will make those rearrangements while you are on break. Thanks very much. Enjoy your break. (Continued on next page)

```
j562van1
1
                (Jury not present)
 2
               THE COURT: See you in ten minutes.
 3
               MS. FENDER: Thank you, your Honor.
 4
                (Recess)
 5
                (Jury not present)
               THE COURT: Ms. Ghosh, you are going to make the
 6
 7
      opening?
 8
               MS. GHOSH: Yes, your Honor.
9
                (Continued on next page)
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

(Jury present)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Ms. Ghosh.

MS. GHOSH: Thank you, your Honor.

This is a case about drug dealers, a ring of drug dealers that sold thousands and thousands of doses of heroin, week after week, for years, including heroin that was mixed with an even more dangerous drug called fentanyl, and these two defendants, Paul Van Manen and Kenneth Charlton, were members of that group who found customers, sold heroin, and ignored the consequences.

In the fall of 2017, one person overdosed on the group's drugs. He was able to be saved by a firefighter. But less than two months later, one of Van Manen's customers wasn't so lucky. When that young man overdosed from drugs, Van Manen had sold him, he died, and that's why we are here today. Because of the choices they made and the things they did, Van Manen and Charlton have been charged with conspiring, or agreeing with others, to distribute heroin and fentanyl and Van Manen has been charged with agreeing to distribute drugs that caused two overdoses, one of them fatal.

Let me step back. I want to do two things in my time before you this afternoon. First, I'm going to give you a preview of what the evidence will show about these defendants' crimes. Then I will explain how the government will prove its

case.

So what will the evidence show? First, you will learn how the defendants got the heroin and fentanyl that they sold to others. You will hear that the defendants were part of a group of heroin dealers who operated mainly out of Staten Island. Most of the time the defendants and others in their group got their heroin from a supplier in Brooklyn, who was just a short trip over the Verrazzano Bridge.

You will learn that they sold their drugs to customers on Staten Island. The heroin came prepackaged from the suppliers in tiny envelopes called glassines or bags. Now, particularly when mixed with fentanyl, just a few of those little bags, even two or three, can cause an overdose. But the defendants and their associates sold hundreds and hundreds of these bags every single day. They sold some of this heroin directly to users. They also acted as middlemen and sold larger amounts of drugs to other dealers who in turn sold to users on the street. The drug crew repeated this cycle day after day. Thousands and thousands of doses of heroin, kilograms worth, for years, from 2013 until January 2018, when the defendants and other members of the drug ring were arrested.

During those years, they worked together to obtain and sell drugs. They drove each other around to customers or to get more heroin from Brooklyn. They sold each other drugs on

credit. They shared and referred customers.

Now, different members of the group had different roles. Van Manen was one of the primary dealers in the drug ring. You will learn that he picked up about 200 to 400 bags of heroin multiple times every week from suppliers and then peddled those drugs to users and other resellers. Charlton was one of the resellers that other members of the heroin ring sold to, and he then sold directly to users. And at times, when his own heroin habit got in the way and he didn't have enough money to buy drugs outright, he referred customers to another dealer in the drug ring. In return, he got drugs to use and to refill his supply so he could keep selling.

Now, both Charlton and Van Manen used some of the heroin themselves, but make no mistake: This was business. Increasing the number of customers, making sure they had high quality product, and trying to turn that product into profit, feeding off the addictions of their customers, nothing was going to get in the way of that business, not even when people got hurt, not even when someone died.

You will learn that one of the people injured by the drugs peddled by this group was himself a dealer in the drug ring. Late one night in October of 2017, Van Manen picked him up and they drove to Brooklyn to pick up drugs from their supplier, as usual. The next morning, this dealer used just two of those little bags of heroin and overdosed. That heroin,

like other batches the drug ring sold, was laced with fentanyl, a drug even more potent, more toxic, than heroin. But the fire department rushed to the scene and they were able to save this man's life. This person's overdose was well known within the drug ring. You will learn that Van Manen talked about it with other members. He talked about how the group's fentanyl-laced heroin, heroin that Van Manen was selling as well, had caused that overdose, but that did not stop Van Manen's drug dealing. Business as usual every day.

In less than two months after that dealer's overdose, Van Manen sold heroin again laced with fentanyl that caused another overdose. This time it was fatal. One of his customers, Michael Ogno, died. You will learn that on December 1, 2017, Van Manen sold heroin to Ogno. That same day, Ogno used that heroin laced with fentanyl and it killed him. Ogno's girlfriend found his body hours later. On his dresser she found the empty bags of the heroin that Van Manen had sold him. On his nightstand was the syringe Ogno had used to inject the drugs. He was just 26 years old. But even this didn't stop Van Manen from continuing to sell. Business as usual.

So that's an overview of what I expect the evidence will show.

Now, how will the government prove its case? Well, partly through the defendants' own words. You will hear and see the defendants planning their sales, negotiating prices,

trying to avoid law enforcement, recruiting new customers. You see, law enforcement had wiretaps on the phones of some members of the drug ring and the defendants' phones were seized and searched after their arrests last year. So you will hear calls and see text messages that they sent to associates and customers when they had no idea they were being recorded, for example, texts in which Charlton refers customers to a dealer in the drug ring or texts in which Charlton agrees to start working for that dealer again after a break because he wasn't using heroin anymore, so he said he wouldn't do something stupid like get arrested. And you will see the text messages between Van Manen and Michael Ogno, the overdose victim, on the day of Ogno's death arranging to meet up so Van Manen could supply Ogno with heroin. Those were the last text messages

You will also see physical evidence, like some of the thousands of heroin bags that were distributed by the defendants and other members of the drug ring, heroin and fentanyl that was seized by law enforcement when their defendants and associates slipped up and sold to an undercover officer or got arrested. You will see photographs, like some taken during surveillance of the defendants and their associates doing drug deals and others from the scenes of the overdoses. You will see evidence of some of the money that the defendants pocketed for peddling their drugs. For instance,

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

you will see records of the money that Michael Ogno sent to

Van Manen on the day he died, payment for the drugs that killed
him.

And you will also hear from a number of witnesses. You will hear from some of the first responders who saw the aftermath of the crew's heroin sales, like the firefighter who was able to revive the dealer who overdosed and the police officer who responded to the scene of Michael Ogno's fatal overdose. You will also hear from Michael's girlfriend. will tell you what she knew about Michael's dealer and what it was like to find his body. You will also hear from law enforcement officers, like a detective who spent months investigating some of the members of the drug ring, and you will hear from members of the heroin ring themselves, insiders who worked directly with the defendants and their associates, who will tell you all about this drug ring. Like the defendants, each of these insiders had a slightly different role, and so each one will give you a different piece of the puzzle. They will explain to you how these two defendants operated, how they got their heroin, where they stored the drugs, how they recruited customers, the inner workings of the group.

Now, make no mistake about it, these witnesses are not testifying out of the goodness of their hearts. Just like the defendants, they are drug dealers who committed serious crimes,

and they are cooperating with the government in the hopes of getting a reduction in their sentences. But the question is not whether you like them or what they have done. The question is whether they are telling you the truth. So listen carefully to their testimony and consider how what they are telling you fits with all of the other evidence in this case, like the phone calls, the text messages, the physical evidence, and the surveillance.

Finally, you will hear from a medical examiner who will explain how the drugs Michael Ogno ingested killed him and why the heroin and fentanyl sold by these defendants is so dangerous.

Now, at the end of the trial, we will have the chance to speak with you again about how all of the evidence fits together. Between now and then, I am going to ask you to do three things: First, pay close attention to the evidence; second, listen to Judge Crotty's instructions on the law; and, third, use your common sense, the same common sense you use in your everyday lives.

If you do those three things, the defendants will get a fair trial, the government will get a fair trial, and you will reach the only verdict consistent with the evidence, the law, and common sense: The defendants, Paul Van Manen and Kenneth Charlton, are guilty.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Ghosh.

Ms. Sideris.

MS. SIDERIS: Thank you, your Honor.

Paul Van Manen is an addict. He is a junkie. He bought heroin from Medin Kosic and he sold that heroin to others, to other addicts. That's not what he is charged with here.

This entire case will start and end with one question:
Was Paul Van Manen a member of the Kosic drug conspiracy? And
the answer to that question is no.

The evidence will show that Medin Kosic was only one of Paul Van Manen's drug dealers. You will hear the truth that Paul did not have any deal with Kosic where he would be able to buy heroin on credit from him. Medin Kosic did not give Paul any discount like he did members of his conspiracy. Kosic would not tell Paul where or to whom he could sell heroin. Kosic would not get any kind of kickback from heroin that Paul sold. Paul did not work for or with Kosic. He did not manage Kosic's stash house. He did not package heroin for Kosic. He did not get him additional customers.

All Paul did was buy grams of heroin at a time, using some for himself to get high and then selling some of it so that he could buy more, to keep the cycle going. The only relationship that existed between Kosic and Paul was that Kosic, the seller, would sell heroin to Paul, the buyer. And ladies and gentlemen, buyer-seller does not make Paul a member

of the charged conspiracy. You will learn that buyer-seller means Paul Van Manen is not guilty.

May it please the court, Judge Crotty; Mr. Van Manen; and ladies and gentleman of the jury:

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your time and cooperation during the jury selection process. I know that jury selection is tedious and a drawn-out process, but I trust you will understand or at least you will come to understand by the end of this trial the importance that jury selection plays in a trial. So on behalf of Mr. Van Manen, Mr. Quijano, and myself, his court-appointed attorneys, thank you.

Now, you have just heard the government's opening statement. You may have thought it was eloquent and even persuasive. It was not evidence of any kind. In fact, up to this point, you have not heard a single word of evidence. Up to this point, all you have heard are allegations and accusations in the form of the indictment and the government's opening statement. Please remember the only reason we are even here today is because Paul Van Manen pled not guilty to the indictment and, as such, he is presumed innocent of each and every allegation.

Perhaps the most important thing I can do, that I can hope to accomplish right now is to remind you of what you have promised to do as jurors, to keep an open mind. Keep an open

mind until you have heard all of the evidence, all of the testimony -- the direct examinations and the cross-examinations.

While you are listening to the government's witnesses and their evidence, please keep an open mind and remember this: After the government's case, you will hear from Paul Van Manen. He is going to testify, and he will tell you the truth about all of the events and his conduct in relation to the government's witnesses.

Paul does not have to testify. That's the law. And under the law, if he doesn't testify, you would not be permitted to hold that against him because he has the fundamental right to remain silent, because the burden of proof is on the government and he is presumed innocent. But he is choosing not to remain silent. He is choosing to testify because he wants to explain the truth, he wants to explain the government's evidence to you, and wants you to hear the truth. So please keep your promise to keep an open mind until Judge Crotty has instructed you on the law.

Ladies and gentlemen, if you keep this basic, fundamental promise, if you keep an open mind, contrary to what you just heard from the government, you will find that the evidence will not establish that Paul Van Manen was a member of Kosic drug conspiracy. The evidence will show that, rather than having joined and been a member of the charged conspiracy,

Paul was merely a customer.

Paul bought heroin from other people as well. The evidence will show that he bought small amounts of heroin every couple of days. He was not loyal to any drug dealer. He just needed to have his heroin.

And you will see that his dealer Kosic knew Paul was an addict. The evidence will show that he would take advantage of that when Paul needed to buy heroin. He would ask for favors when Paul was on the way: Pick up a slice of pizza; get me a ride somewhere. None of that benefited Paul in any way. He didn't get a discount. His dealer, his seller, Kosic, was just using an addict because he could.

The evidence will show that Paul and his friend Doreen Spinelli bought heroin together. They used heroin together. They would also sell heroin together to other addicts and then use that money to buy more heroin for themselves. The evidence will show that before selling any of their heroin, the first thing that Paul and Doreen would do is take care of themselves. They would get high. They were always first in line and first to taste.

The evidence will show that Paul would buy small amounts of heroin from Kosic -- ten to 20 bundles at a time. That's not kilograms of heroin. That's not a pound of heroin. That's not an ounce of heroin. The evidence will show that's what amounted to grams of heroin. You will learn that in one

bundle of heroin is ten tiny envelopes containing around .03 grams of heroin. So in an entire bundle of heroin is less than half a gram.

Paul engaged in criminal conduct. He possessed and he sold heroin. He himself will admit that to you. He doesn't deny that. He doesn't try to hide that. Those are crimes, but not the crime charged here. That's not the question you will be asked at the end of the trial. The question is whether Paul Van Manen is guilty — is a member of the conspiracy charged in the indictment.

As you know, the government is also claiming that, as a result of his alleged involvement in the conspiracy, Paul Van Manen is responsible for Michael Ogno's death on December 1, 2017, and also for an individual Shaun Sullivan's alleged overdose on October 5, 2017.

The evidence will show that when Michael Ogno tragically died of an overdose, found in his system was a combination of drugs -- fentanyl, heroin, and Xanax. At some point before he died, Michael Ogno ingested heroin, fentanyl, and Xanax. All contributed to his death. The evidence will show that Michael Ogno and Paul Van Manen were friends; that, like Paul, Michael Ogno was a drug addict, he was addicted to heroin and other drugs; that Michael Ogno and his childhood friend, Derek Yung used heroin and other drugs together starting from high school; that Paul sold heroin to Michael

Ogno; that Paul sold heroin to Derek Yung; also that Derek Yung sold heroin to Michael Ogno and Derek Yung sold heroin to Paul. The evidence will show that Derek Yung and Michael Ogno bought heroin and other drugs from various dealers. You are not going to hear evidence that it was heroin or fentanyl from Paul that caused Michael Ogno's death. At the end of all the evidence, you will not hear from where Michael Ogno got the drugs that led to his fatal overdose.

Now, Shaun Sullivan's overdose on October 5, you will hear evidence that Shaun Sullivan was a drug dealer. He was part of the charged conspiracy. He and his wife Diane used heroin together and sold heroin together. They sold heroin to a lot of people. On the morning of his alleged overdose, Shaun Sullivan and his girlfriend, Corrine, were using heroin together; that on October 5, at around 9 a.m. Shaun Sullivan and Corrine were in a bed and breakfast in Staten Island getting high, and Corrine called 911.

Thirteen hours earlier, Paul and Doreen were on their way to pick up heroin from their dealer, Kosic, and they gave Shaun Sullivan a ride. The evidence will show that, per Kosic's request, it was Shaun Sullivan alone who got out of the car and met with Kosic to purchase the heroin for himself and Paul and Doreen. After Shaun Sullivan gave them their heroin, Paul and Doreen proceeded to get high without incident.

The next day, the next morning, Corrine called 911.

Shaun was taken to the hospital and left a few hours later.

The evidence will not show what drugs were in his system, but

Shaun Sullivan is going to testify in this case as a

cooperating witness.

In attempting to meet its burden beyond a reasonable doubt that Paul Van Manen was a member of this conspiracy, the government will rely on the testimony of three cooperating witnesses. Unlike Paul, all three of them were members of the charged conspiracy. The evidence will show that they have pled guilty to the same charge that Paul faces, but before they pled quilty, they made and signed a deal with the government.

The evidence will show in this deal the parties are the government and the witness. Judge Crotty is not part of this deal. And like any deal, each party is getting a benefit. You will learn that the government gets this witness to plead guilty and the government gets this witness to cooperate, to testify. In return, the witness gets the government will write a letter to Judge Crotty when it comes time for that witness's sentencing, a very powerful letter. The witness will tell you that for what he has pled guilty, for that charge, he can be sentenced up to a maximum of life imprisonment and the witness will tell you for what he pled guilty there is a mandatory minimum sentence. For Shaun Sullivan and Anthony Francese, they are facing a mandatory minimum of ten years in prison. For Jasmin Cejovic, he is facing a mandatory minimum of 20

years in prison. But with this letter that the government will write to Judge Crotty, they no longer face the mandatory minimum sentence. The evidence will show that, with that letter, Judge Crotty can sentence the witness to anything from zero to life. That is their deal. That is what the witnesses understood they could get for testifying against Paul Van Manen.

Now, the witnesses will tell you that to get this letter, they have to do more than just testify. They must tell the truth. Listen carefully to the witness when he tells you who decides if he told the truth to qualify for this amazing letter that lets him escape a mandatory minimum sentence. For the purpose of the letter, it is not you who decides. It is also not Judge Crotty. The witness knows it is the government who decides if the witness has told the truth, it is the government who decides if Shaun Sullivan and Anthony Francese have the chance to escape from a mandatory minimum sentence of at least ten years, and it is the government who decides if Jasmin Cejovic can escape a prison sentence of at least 20 years.

Please bear that in mind. Remember that as you evaluate the testimony of Shaun Sullivan, Anthony Francese, and Jasmin Cejovic. Listen to Shaun Sullivan when he tells you how worried he was about facing more than ten years when he decided to cooperate and testify against Paul.

Another witness you will hear from is Derek Yung. For testifying against Paul Van Manen, Derek Yung gets the promise of never being prosecuted for the crimes which he is going to admit -- which he has admitted -- selling drugs, selling heroin, including selling heroin to his with a childhood friend Michael Ogno, who had a fatal overdose. And all Derek Yung has to do is testify against Paul Van Manen. And if the government decides he told the truth, he gets to walk away and he never has to even plead guilty to a crime.

Some of the evidence in this case will be in the form of phone calls or text messages. Please remember, these may appear to have one meaning on their face, but we all know that, out of context, words or even short conversations, these can be interpreted to have any meaning, they can be interpreted to have two opposite, extreme — extreme opposite meanings depending on who is doing the interpretation, especially text messages. So wait to hear for the explanation from Paul. Wait to hear from him the truth. Keep an open mind.

In a short while, the trial will start. Witnesses will be called. They will testify. They will be cross-examined, and the parties will give their closing arguments. All I ask from you at this point is that you stay true to your oath as jurors; that you keep an open mind until you have heard from Paul Van Manen himself, until you have heard the final instructions from Judge Crotty.

After all of the evidence, Peter Quijano will come before you and he will ask from you the only verdict that the facts and the law will demand in this case: a verdict of not guilty.

Thank you.

THE COURT: Thank you, Ms. Sideris.

Ms. O'Neill.

MS. O'NEILL: Buying heroin doesn't work like buying a gallon of milk at the grocery store or ordering eggplant parmigiana at your favorite Italian restaurant. It's a game of cat and mouse, where addicts and dealers are constantly trying to get what one wants and the other needs. And that makes sense because heroin is illegal.

Now, Kenny Charlton was a homeless heroin addict who was friends with other heroin addicts, and when they needed to score, they got as much money together as they could, they pooled that money and they started working the phones so that they could get ahold of one of their many heroin dealers. They got as much as they could together, they called as many dealers as they could, and then one of them answered the phone.

Finding drugs and hustling dealers is all part of being a heroin addict. And for Kenny, for Kenny, when he was addicted to heroin, lying to his dealers was what it took to get heroin. When he was trying to score, he called multiple dealers and his friends called multiple dealers just so that

they could get heroin. He lied to those dealers to get them to come. And if one of those dealers didn't show up, he lied to them again. He lied to them later and he said, oh, you missed out. You missed out on the best customer. You missed out. You missed out on all this money. You missed out. You were going to get a new regular customer. He told them how many customers they would have had if only, if only, they would have shown up when he asked them to.

This was part of Kenny Charlton's game. This was what kept dealers interested in him. And that makes sense, doesn't it? It makes sense. Just think about a homeless junkie in your mind. It's a person who would say anything to get heroin. And tragically, that is what Kenny Charlton's life had become. It had become a never-ending quest for heroin, a never-ending series of lies and manipulations. Kenny Charlton lost his work, he lost his home, he lost his self-respect to heroin. He was in the margins of society and heroin had broken him.

The government is going to show you text messages and phone calls from Kenny to one of his many heroin dealers and they are going to show you messages of him promising to pass the dealer's name to other heroin addicts. You are going to hear him begging his dealer, offering anything he could just to get heroin. "I have two Suboxones, please." Trying to make the dealer feel sorry for him, "I'm pawning my tools. I'm pawning my motorcycle seat. I'm pawning my guitar. I'm

picking weeds, please."

Yes. Before heroin ruined, ruined, Kenny Charlton's life, he used to be a motorcycle-riding, guitar-playing, union carpenter. Now, by the time he was arrested in this case, Kenny was a homeless junkie. He lied. He stole, he was barely alive, and this, this, is what drug addiction looks like. This is what seven years of heroin addiction looks like. This is what desperation looks like. This is what heroin does to people. You lose everything to it. You lose everything. And that, that is why it is illegal. That is why the government is supposed to be prosecuting drug dealers. Many of Kenny's friends have overdosed and died, and Kenny himself has overdosed. Nobody would want their child to grow up to be like Kenny Charlton.

The truth, the truth in this case is that Kenny had many dealers, all different, but all very much the same. His dealers were people who had what he needed. Some dealers were better and worse than others. Some dealers had better and worse prices. Some dealers charged more or less at various times. Some dealers were more responsive. And some dealers were eager for his business. He circled through those dealers, calling them, texting them, telling them whatever it took to get heroin, and he had to do this every single day.

The government arrested Kenny Charlton in this case and they charged him with participating in one of his heroin

j562van1

dealer's narcotics conspiracies. The government is going to put forth a bunch of witnesses and, quite honestly, we aren't going to ask a lot of questions and that's because these witnesses have nothing to do with Kenny and that's because Kenny was not a member of this group or ring or conspiracy or whatever you want to call it.

And then, and then, the government is going to bring in one of Kenny Charlton's drug dealers to testify against him. That's right. Jasmin Cejovic, the dealer Kenny knew as Min is the government's main witness against Kenny. Kenny wasn't a part of the conspiracy we are talking about here. He didn't know anything about the operation. He didn't know anything about who Kosic was or where the stash house was. He didn't know any of this, and he didn't care to. Who Min got his drugs from or where they were stored, that wasn't anything to him. He just needed to get high. He kept Min's number, he used it off and on for stretches of time, and then Min cut him off, and then he hustled another dealer until that one cut him off. That's what being a drug addict is. That's what it does to you. It is a vicious, vicious cycle, over and over and over again, trying desperately to get drugs.

The truth? The truth is that Min preyed on Kenny and addicts like him. To Min, Kenny was just a dollar sign. Min's this wannabe Playboy gangster, dressing in fur coats and fancy watches, making a rap video, making a rap video while he was

```
j562van1
      out on bail in this case about selling drugs.
 1
 2
                 (Continued on next page)
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

MS. O'NEILL: And Min, Min is now allowed to prey on Kenny again, as Min tries to trade his jail sentence for He made hundreds of thousands of dollars preying on the backs of addicts, just like Kenny, and now he is going to get time off his sentence? He is going to get time off his sentence for testifying against Kenny?

When you are hearing this guy talk, ask yourself: this for real? Is this guy believable? He is not. He is not believable. He is a liar. He is a liar. And when I come back up here at closing, you are going to hear me tell you exactly how he lied.

Kenny Charlton was a heroin addict. There is absolutely no denying that. He tried to get as much heroin as he could so that he could get high. That's what he did. There is no denying that.

You could say there is something wrong with his character; he was weak; he succumbed to addiction. But this case, this case is not about whether Kenny Charlton is weak or an addict or a small-time con. It is about whether Kenny Charlton was a member, a member of this conspiracy, to distribute narcotics. And ladies and gentlemen, that is ridiculous.

Kenny Charlton isn't Min or the other members of this conspiracy. He is a victim. He is a drug addict. He is a victim of this conspiracy. He is not a perpetrator. Kenny

```
Charlton is innocent of these charges. Kenny Charlton is not a
1
      drug dealer and not a member of this conspiracy. And when you
 2
      hear all the evidence, I know that you will return the only
 3
      verdict that is just, and that is that Kenny Charlton is not
 4
 5
      quilty.
6
               Thank you.
 7
                           Government will call its first witness.
               THE COURT:
 8
               MS. GHOSH: Your Honor, the government calls Lee Wong.
9
               THE DEPUTY CLERK: Please state and spell your full
10
      name for the record.
11
               THE WITNESS: First name Lee, L-E-E, last name Wong,
12
      W-O-N-G.
13
       LEE WONG,
           called as a witness by the government,
14
15
           having been duly sworn, testified as follows:
               THE COURT: Please sit down and make yourself
16
17
      comfortable.
18
               Pull yourself right up to the microphone.
               OK, Ms. Ghosh.
19
20
      DIRECT EXAMINATION
21
     BY MS. GHOSH:
22
          Sir, where do you work?
      Q.
23
          256 Hylan Boulevard, Staten Island, New York.
      Α.
          What is that?
24
      Ο.
25
          That is our firehouse.
      Α.
```

- Wong Direct
- 1 | Q. How long have you been employed at the firehouse?
- 2 A. I have been on the fire department for two and a half years.
- 4 | Q. What is your current title?
- 5 A. Firefighter.
- 6 Q. Generally speaking, what are your duties and
- 7 responsibilities as a firefighter?
- 8 A. As a firefighter we respond to any emergency in regards to
- 9 | fires, gas emergencies, water emergencies, as well as emergency
- 10 | medical service.
- 11 | Q. What do you mean by emergency medical services?
- 12 A. It could be an array of things, cardiac arrests, trauma,
- 13 anything in regards to, if you call 911, we are usually the
- 14 first ones to respond.
- 15 | Q. What type of training do you receive regarding emergency
- 16 | medical service procedures?
- 17 A. The type of training that we receive, right before you go
- 18 | into the academy they give you training in the academy for
- 19 | about 16 weeks, as well as a refresher course for emergency
- 20 medical services every three years after that.
- 21 | Q. Firefighter Wong, directing your attention to October 5,
- 22 | 2017, were you working that day?
- 23 | A. Yes, I was.
- 24 | Q. About how long had you been with the fire department at
- 25 | that time?

- A. At that time, I just finished graduating April 12th of 2017. So I figure about a couple of months.
- 3 Q. On October 5, 2017, what shift were you working?
 - A. That would be the 9 by 6, or 9 a.m. to 6 p.m.
- 5 | Q. Were you working alone or with others?
- 6 A. I was working with others.
 - Q. Did there come a time on that day when you were asked to
- 8 respond to a potential overdose?
- 9 A. Yes.

4

- 10 | Q. How did you first get notified?
- 11 A. We received a ticket through the Staten Island dispatcher
- 12 | office via computer. That ticket is then relayed to our
- 13 | firehouse and we respond, and we basically turn out the company
- 14 | at that point.
- 15 \parallel Q. Where was the incident that you were responding to?
- 16 A. I believe it was 1 Hylan Boulevard, on the corner of Hylan
- 17 | and Edgewater.
- 18 | Q. What is located there?
- 19 A. That would be a three-story multiple dwelling that was
- 20 converted into a bed and breakfast.
- 21 | Q. About how long did it take you to get to that location?
- 22 | A. A matter of minutes because it's only about three blocks
- 23 | from our firehouse.
- 24 | Q. You mentioned a moment ago that once you got the ticket you
- 25 | turned out the company. Can you just explain what that means?

- A. Turning out the company would be 10-4'ing or acknowledging
 the run via computer so that the Staten Island dispatcher knows
 that we are on our way, as well as reading the ticket out for
 everyone else in the firehouse, our members, so they know what
 they are responding to.
 - Q. I would like to show you now what has been marked for identification as Government Exhibit 272.
 - MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, if you could put that up just on the witness screen.
- 10 | Q. Firefighter Wong, do you recognize this?
- 11 | A. Yes.

7

8

9

15

16

17

- 12 \parallel Q. What is it?
- 13 A. That is the address where we responded for the patient or 14 the victim.
 - MS. GHOSH: Your Honor, the government offers Government Exhibit 272 into evidence.
 - MR. QUIJANO: No objection.
- 18 THE COURT: 272 is received in evidence.
- 19 (Government's Exhibit 272 received in evidence)
- MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, can you please publish
- 21 Government Exhibit 272 for the jury.
- 22 BY MS. GHOSH:
- Q. Firefighter Wong, when you arrived at this building, where did you go?
 - A. When we first pulled up to the building, we went to the

- 1 | front of the building, parked there.
- 2 | Q. What did you do after parking?
- 3 A. I proceeded to exit the vehicle, do a quick size-up of the
- 4 | building, as well as grab the EMS supplies that we were going
- 5 | to be needing for whoever was in there.
- 6 Q. Where did you go next?
- 7 A. We proceeded to the front entrance of the building up the
- 8 | stairs -- from the picture you can see it -- and then we were
- 9 met by hotel management.
- 10 | Q. What happened after you met hotel management in the
- 11 | building?
- 12 | A. He proceeded to let us know that we had a male, a young
- 13 | male --
- 14 MR. QUIJANO: Objection.
- 15 THE COURT: Overruled.
- 16 A. He proceeded to let us know that there was a male in the
- 17 | establishment that was not responding and possibly unconscious.
- 18 | Q. Where did you go next?
- 19 | A. We proceeded to follow him to the second floor of the
- 20 | building.
- 21 | Q. Who went to the second floor?
- 22 | A. That was myself and two other firefighters, as well as the
- 23 | lieutenant and the hotel manager.
- 24 | Q. What did you see when you got to the second floor?
- 25 A. When we proceeded to the second floor, the room of that

5

6

7

8

9

- 1 particular floor was open and we found an unconscious male.
- Q. I would like to show you now what has been marked for identification as Government Exhibits 212A, B and E.
 - MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, if you can put those up for the witness, please.
 - Q. Firefighter Wong, do you recognize these three exhibits?
 - A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. What are they?
 - A. Those are pictures of the room where we found the victim.
- Q. Are they fair and accurate depictions of the room that you entered on October 5, 2017?
- 12 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- MS. GHOSH: Your Honor, the government offers

 Government Exhibits 212A, B, and E into evidence.
- MR. QUIJANO: No objection.
- 16 THE COURT: 212A, B and E are received.
- 17 (Government's Exhibits 212A, 212B and 212E received in evidence)
- MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, can you please publish 212A for the jury to start with.
- 21 BY MS. GHOSH:
- Q. Firefighter Wong, can you describe what view is depicted in this photograph?
- 24 A. That is the entrance to the room where we found the victim.
- MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, if you could put up 212B and

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

23

24

25

Wong - Direct

- 1 | publish that for the jury.
- Q. Firefighter Wong, can you describe what is depicted in this photograph?
 - A. That would be the bed where we found the unconscious male.
 - Q. Using the touchscreen in front of you, can you circle where you found the victim, where he was when you first saw him?
 - A. Yes, ma'am. Give me one moment.

MS. GHOSH: Let the record reflect the witness has circled, from the view of the person looking at the photograph, the right side of the bed.

THE COURT: Yes.

- MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, if you could publish 212E for the jury, please.
- Q. Firefighter Wong, can you describe what view is depicted in this photograph?
- A. From the entranceway, if I was standing in front of the bed in the previous picture, that would be to my rear.
- Q. What did you do first when you arrived at this room?
- A. When I first arrived in the room, my lieutenant was taking
 a quick look at the patient. I asked him to move out of the
 way so I can assess the patient and see what kind of condition
 he was in.
 - Q. I am going to show you now what has been marked as Government Exhibit 273.
 - MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, can you put that up for the

Wong - Direct

1 | witness.

4

- 2 | Q. Did you recognize this individual?
- 3 | A. Yes, I do.
 - Q. Who is it?
- 5 A. That is the patient that was unconscious on the bed.
- 6 MS. GHOSH: The government moves to admit Government 7 Exhibit 273.
- 8 MR. QUIJANO: No objection.
 - THE COURT: 273 is in evidence.
- 10 (Government's Exhibit 273 received in evidence)
- MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, if we can publish that for the
- 12 jury, please.
- 13 | Q. Firefighter Wong, do you know this individual's name?
- 14 | A. No, I do not.
- Q. What observations did you make about this individual when
- 16 you first saw him?
- 17 A. When I first saw him, he was unresponsive.
- 18 | Q. Can you describe what you mean by him being unresponsive?
- 19 \parallel A. When I finally got the lieutenant out of the way and I
- 20 | began to assess him, I noticed that his breathing was very
- 21 | shallow; his pupils, when I checked him with the flashlight,
- 22 were pinpointed or dilated. I proceeded to try to pinch the
- 23 patient on his extremities, his arms and his legs, and I
- 24 received no response.
- 25 | Q. What, if anything, did you notice about the individual's

1 | pulse?

- 2 A. When I checked his radial as well as his carotid, they were weak.
 - Q. What do you mean by his radial or carotid?
- A. The carotid is the large nerve on his neck, as well as his radial which is on his wrist of his arms.
- 7 | Q. You mentioned a moment ago that his pupils were dilated.
- 8 Can you explain what you mean by that, what the significance of someone's pupils being dilated is?
- 10 | A. Pupils being dilated can show signs of a possible overdose.
- 11 | Q. Based on your training, what is the risk to someone with
- 12 | these symptoms that you mentioned -- the shallow breathing,
- 13 weak pulse, dilated pupils -- if treatment is not rendered to
- 14 | them?
- 15 A. If treatment is not rendered to them, they would be
- 16 deceased.
- Q. What did you do after determining that this victim was
- 18 | nonresponsive?
- 19 A. After seeing that he was not responsive, I then proceeded
- 20 to assemble the naloxone or Narcan kit for distribution.
- MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, if you can put up for the witness Government Exhibits 276, 277 and 278.
- 23 Q. Firefighter Wong, did you just see those three photographs?
- 24 A. Yes, I did.
- 25 | Q. Do you recognize what they showed?

- 1 | A. Yes, I do.
- $2 \parallel Q$. What is it?
- A. They are the components of the naloxone, or Narcan kit,
- 4 that we use for someone suffering from an overdose.
- 5 MS. GHOSH: Your Honor, the government offers Exhibits
- 6 | 276, 277 and 278 into evidence.
- 7 MR. QUIJANO: No objection.
- 8 THE COURT: Received in evidence 276, 277 and 278.
 - (Government's Exhibits 276, 277 and 278 received in
- 10 | evidence)

- MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, if you could please publish
- 12 Government Exhibit 276 for the jury.
- 13 BY MS. GHOSH:
- 14 | Q. Firefighter Wong, can you explain what we see in this
- 15 | photograph?
- 16 A. That is the vial that contains the medication used for
- 17 someone that is suffering from an opioid overdose.
- MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, if you could publish 278,
- 19 please.
- 20 My mistake, if you can go to 277 first.
- 21 | Q. Firefighter Wong, what does this view show?
- 22 A. That shows the rear part of the vial showing the dosage
- 23 amounts.
- MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, if you could just zoom in on
- 25 the vials so we can see it a little closer, please.

4

5

6

7

8

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

Wong - Direct

- Q. When you say it shows the dosage amounts, what are you referring to?
 - A. The 0 and 0.5; 1 and 1.5.

MS. GHOSH: Now if we could publish Exhibit 278 for the jury.

- O. What does this show?
- A. That shows the actual injection or component that introduces the medication to the patient.
- 9 Q. Can you explain how this works, the three photographs we 10 have seen, how it all works together?
 - A. Basically, what happens is that the vial gets screwed into this component right here -- I'm just going to circle it for you.
 - MS. GHOSH: Let the record reflect the witness has circled the yellow item on the top of Exhibit 278.

THE COURT: Yes.

- A. That vial then gets screwed on the bottom of that component. Once it's screwed on, then we would place the nasal distribution device, which is this component here, on top of it.
- MS. GHOSH: Let the record reflect the witness has circled the white object at the bottom of the photo as the nasal distribution device.

24 THE COURT: Yes.

A. Once those components are put together, we would then place

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

15

18

Wong - Direct

- it in the patient's nose, one of their nostrils, and proceed to squeeze the plunger or the syringe on it, and they would receive the medication.
- Q. Let's just step back for a moment. You mentioned Narcan and naloxone. Can you explain what those are?
 - A. Narcan or naloxone is the same. Naloxone is the proper term, but we use Narcan on the job. Basically, what it does is it prevents someone from overdosing. It attaches itself to the mucous membranes in your nose, or the membranes in your nose, and proceeds to stop the reaction that causes an overdose.
 - Q. What kind of overdose is Narcan or naloxone meant to disrupt?
 - A. Products that contain opioids, heroins, things like that.
- Q. What sort of training have you received on the use of
- 16 A. Narcan is part of our emergency medical service training
 17 over at the fire department, EMS academy, or emergency service
 - academy.

Narcan?

- 19 Q. Does your training include how to recognize when it's 20 necessary to use Narcan?
- 21 | A. Yes, it is.
- Q. Based on your training and experience, what is your understanding as to why Narcan is used?
- A. Narcan is used for someone that is suffering from an overdose. It is used to get them out of their overdose so that

- 1 | they do not, for lack of a better word, die.
- 2 Q. What is your understanding of what could happen if Narcan
- 3 | is not administered to someone who is overdosing on opioids?
- 4 A. If it's not introduced to them as soon as possible, that
- 5 person would be deceased.
- 6 Q. Turning back now to October 5, 2017, how much Narcan did
- 7 | you first administer to the victim?
- 8 A. When we first arrived, we proceeded to give the victim
- 9 point five or a little less than point five milligrams in the
- 10 vial.
- 11 | Q. Did the victim revive after you gave him the point five
- 12 | milligrams?
- 13 A. Negative. He was still unresponsive.
- 14 | Q. What did you do next?
- 15 | A. I proceeded to reassess the patient. I saw that there was
- 16 no change in his condition. So I then proceeded to give him
- 17 | the whole vial.
- 18 | Q. What happened after you administered the rest of the vial
- 19 of Narcan?
- 20 A. Within a few minutes, the patient started to come to or
- 21 | become conscious; he opened his eyes.
- 22 | Q. Did there come a time when other responders arrived on the
- 23 scene?
- 24 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 25 | Q. Who arrived next?

- A. The next parties that arrived were the EMTs, or the emergency medical technicians.
 - Q. What did the EMTs do when they arrived?
- A. When they first arrived on the scene, I turned to face them and let them know what we had so they can begin assessing the
- 6 patient.

- 7 \mathbb{Q} . What is the role of EMTs?
- 8 A. The emergency medical technicians are the next line in
- 9 regards to our emergency responses. We are considered
- 10 certified first responders, so our role is to stabilize the
- 11 patient or to get them stabilized enough so that the emergency
- 12 | medical technicians can start working on them or possibly
- 13 | transport them for emergency purposes.
- 14 | Q. Why does an EMT respond to an incident such as this in
- 15 | addition to someone like you responding?
- 16 A. They received additional medical training to try to combat
- 17 | the possible signs of overdoses or other emergencies that
- 18 someone may have.
- 19 Q. After the EMTs arrived, did any other responders arrive at
- 20 | the scene?
- 21 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 22 | Q. Who arrived next?
- 23 A. Next was the next level of our emergency response, that
- 24 | would be the paramedics, as well as the New York Police
- 25 Department after that.

- Q. What is the role of the paramedics?
- 2 A. The paramedics are, for lack of a better word, they are the
- 3 | last say in regards to emergency responses. They have
- 4 | additional training that both the certified first responders
- 5 | and the EMTs do not have. They are also able to give someone
- 6 medication or different types of ways to stimulate the body if
- 7 | they are going into cardiac arrest.
- 8 Q. You mentioned the NYPD arrived as well?
- 9 A. Yes, ma'am.
- 10 | Q. What is your understanding of why NYPD responds to
- 11 | suspected overdoses?
- 12 | A. NYPD responds basically to oversee and take notes, take
- 13 control of the, I guess, location that we are in, to make sure
- 14 | that nothing is being moved out of the room, as well as taking
- 15 notes of who provided what and what order everybody responded.
- 16 Q. Is it your understanding that it's common procedure for
- 17 | NYPD to respond to overdoses?
- 18 | A. Yes, ma'am.
- 19 Q. About how long after the victim was revived did you leave
- 20 | the room?
- 21 | A. Approximately 20 to 30 minutes, give or take.
- 22 | Q. Why did you leave then?
- 23 A. We were advised by the paramedics that we were no longer
- 24 | needed.
- 25 | Q. Other than responding to this incident on October 5, 2017,

3

4

6

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Wong - Direct

- 1 | did you have any other involvement in this investigation?
 - A. No, I did not.
 - Q. Why does this incident stand out so clearly in your mind?
 - A. It stands out so clearly because that was actually the

5 | first time I ever had to administer Narcan to a patient. It

was only a matter of months after my graduation, and frankly, I

7 was a little nervous.

MS. GHOSH: Just a moment, your Honor.

At this time, we would like to read a stipulation into the record. This is Government Exhibit 508, a stipulation concerning fire department records.

The stipulation states that:

It is agreed between the parties that Government Exhibits 801 through 803 are true and correct copies of records of the New York City Fire Department, relating to an October 5, 2017 incident, that were made at or near the time of their creation by, or from information transmitted by, a person with knowledge of the matters set forth in the records, and kept in the course of regularly conducted activity of the New York City Fire Department.

Specifically, Government Exhibit 801 is a naloxone usage report.

Government Exhibit 802 is a pre-hospital care report summary.

Government Exhibit 803 is an incident history report.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Wong - Direct

The parties agree that Exhibits 801 through 803 are authentic business records of the New York City Fire Department. The parties further agree that this stipulation and Exhibits 801 through 803 may be received into evidence at trial subject to any objections by the defendants on relevance grounds. The government moves to admit Government Exhibits 801, 802 and 803. MR. QUIJANO: No objection. THE COURT: 801, 802 and 803 will received in evidence. (Government's Exhibits 801, 802 and 803 received in evidence) MS. GHOSH: We would also move Government Exhibit 508, the stipulation, into evidence. THE COURT: 508 is received in evidence as well. (Government's Exhibit 508 received in evidence) MS. GHOSH: Ms. Dunbar, if you can pull up Exhibit 801, please. Could you publish that for the jury. BY MS. GHOSH: Firefighter Wong, do you have that in front of you? Α. Yes, I do. This report mentions a Lieutenant Shea on the fourth line

- 1 on the upper left?
- 2 A. Yes.

6

7

8

9

14

15

20

25

- 3 \ Q. Do you know who that is?
- 4 A. That was an officer that was covering at the time in my 5 firehouse.
 - Q. Could you read the date that's listed on this report?
 - A. That would be October 5th of 2017.
 - Q. What is the time administered?
 - A. 9:17.
- THE COURT: A.m. or p.m.?
- 11 THE WITNESS: That would be a.m., your Honor.
- MS. GHOSH: The government would now like to read another stipulation concerning hospital records. This is

Government Exhibit 502.

- The parties agree that Government Exhibit 901 is a true and correct copy of records of Staten Island University
- 18 | Hospital, located at 475 Seaview Avenue, Staten Island, New
- 19 York, relating to the October 5, 2017 admission of an

This stipulation says that:

21 creation by, or from information transmitted by, a person with

individual, that were made at or near the time of their

- 22 knowledge of the matters set forth in the records, and were
- 23 kept in the course of a regularly conducted activity of Staten
- 24 Island University Hospital.
 - The government offers Government Exhibit 502, the

1	stipulation, into evidence.
2	MR. QUIJANO: No objection.
3	THE COURT: 502 is in evidence.
4	(Government's Exhibit 502 received in evidence)
5	MS. GHOSH: The government offers Government Exhibit
6	901 into evidence.
7	MR. QUIJANO: No objection.
8	THE COURT: 901 is in evidence.
9	(Government's Exhibit 901 received in evidence)
10	MS. GHOSH: Your Honor, this may be I think it's
11	4:30. Should we break, your Honor?
12	THE COURT: Do you have much more for the firefighter?
13	MS. GHOSH: Not much more.
14	THE COURT: Do you have cross-examination?
15	MR. QUIJANO: Yes, your Honor.
16	THE COURT: We will break now.
17	You are excused. You have to come back tomorrow
18	morning at 9:30.
19	THE WITNESS: Thank you, your Honor.
20	THE COURT: Ladies and gentlemen, we are going to
21	break for the day now. We start at 9:30 and finish at 4:30.
22	Please remember my instructions. Don't discuss the
23	case. Keep an open mind. Don't do any independent research.
24	Safe home tonight, and we will see you tomorrow morning at
25	9:30. We will have coffee and tea for you at 9:30.

20

21

22

23

24

25

1 (Jury exits courtroom) 2 THE COURT: Anything to take up? 3 MR. FINKEL: Just one thing from the government. The ruling that this Court issued this morning, it's 4 5 the government's understanding that your Honor's ruling with 6 respect sympathy arguments was predicated on the notion that 7 the defendants would be taking the stand. Obviously, in Ms. Sideris's opening for Mr. Van Manen, it made clear that Mr. Van 8 9 Manen will be testifying here. Ms. O'Neill's opening, however, 10 introduced a lot of facts that are not going to be in evidence 11 unless Mr. Charlton takes the stand, for example, his loss of a 12 job, the fact that he overdosed, the fact that friends of his 13 overdosed. So we would just like to know whether or not Mr. 14 Charlton is going to take the stand. Otherwise the government 15 has an application to strike sympathy arguments based on this 16 Court's ruling this morning. 17 THE COURT: Ms. O'Neill. 18

MS. O'NEILL: If Mr. Charlton does not take the stand, we can strike the parts of the opening, as your Honor ruled earlier this morning.

THE COURT: Do what?

MS. O'NEILL: I understood that your Honor ruled that if the defendants don't testify, that you will be striking our opening statements, portions of them.

THE COURT: Yes.

MS. O'NEILL: OK.

THE COURT: So you don't want to advise us now whether Mr. Charlton is going to take the stand or not?

MS. O'NEILL: Why would I?

MR. FINKEL: Your Honor, when counsel, whether it's the government or defense, makes an opening statement in a federal trial, they have an obligation to argue facts with good faith they believe will be introduced into evidence in this case. You can't have it both ways. You can't a week from now or seven days from now ask the jury to then strike several arguments that they heard seven days ago. If Ms. O'Neill hasn't thought through whether or not Mr. Charlton is going to take the stand, and it appears to the government that he is not going to, and therefore in the morning tomorrow the government asks that Ms. O'Neill's arguments about sympathy be struck.

THE COURT: What do you say, Ms. O'Neill?

MS. O'NEILL: It's hard to even respond to this.

THE COURT: You can't keep on making representations about what you're going to prove contingent upon your client's testifying. It's going to be four or five days by the time you make your decision. In the meantime you have been making all these arguments, leaving in the jury's mind — this is kind of like something out Trump world, where you keep on talking about what you're going to do, but you never get around to doing it.

MS. O'NEILL: But we haven't started our case or

```
cross-examined any witnesses yet.
1
2
               THE COURT: I will think about this overnight.
               MR. FINKEL: Thank you, your Honor.
3
               MS. FENDER: What time would you like to see the
 4
5
     parties tomorrow before the jury resumes?
6
               THE COURT: I will be in at 8:30, 9:00.
 7
               Why don't you get here at 20 after 9.
8
               MS. FENDER: Thank you, your Honor.
9
               THE COURT: See you in the morning.
10
               (Adjourned to May 7, 2019, at 9:20 a.m.)
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

1	INDEX OF EXAMINATION
2	Examination of: Page
3	LEE WONG
4	Direct By Ms. Ghosh
5	GOVERNMENT EXHIBITS
6	Exhibit No. Received
7	272
8	212A, 212B and 212E
9	273
10	276, 277 and 278
11	801, 802 and 803
12	508
13	502
14	901
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	